

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are present in this reissue application. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 6 are amended; whereas claims 7, 8 and 9 are added.

Claim 1 is amended to recite that a single pump can both fill the pipeline and do the hydrostatic testing (see col.7, lines 1-5; "...or just one pump.") and fix a typographical error where the words "to assure" were left out (see claim 4, line 9).

Claim 4 is amended to limit the method to fill and cleaning, a restriction was made to the dewatering of the pipeline and all claims related to dewatering will be made in the divisional application. Other amendments were made to eliminate words of possible limitation and to include one pump.

Claim 5 is amended to eliminate "pumps".

Claim 6 is amended as discussed above.

The overcoming of the rejection of the claims over the Bliss and Graves patents during the prosecution of the original application did not involve the number of pumps but was due to the fact that the references failed individually or in combination to disclose the hydrostatic testing of a pipeline on the seafloor; and specifically, using a SV to operate one or more pumps that are capable of drawing water near the seafloor and pump the water into the pipeline.

Amended claim 6 therefore raises no issues of patentability over the allowance of original claim 6.

New claim 7 raises no issues of patentability over the allowance of original claim 6. The claim recites that the pipeline is on the seafloor but the potentially

argumentative words “before its ends are connected wherein both ends are” have been deleted. An intentional misreading of the words may make the step inoperable since to perform the hydrostatic testing, the ends of the pipeline must be closed and thus connected to something that terminates each end of the pipeline. The words are operational in meaning and were intended to have that meaning; i.e. the testing is done before the operational connecting to product flow into the pipeline and the operational connecting to allow the flow of product out of the pipeline. It is respectfully submitted that this clarification does not raise a patentability question over the references.

New claim 8 raises no issues of patentability over the allowance of original claim 6. This claim has more specifics than claim 7.

New claim 9 raises no issues of patentability over the allowance of original claim 6. This claim recites that the pipeline is between two manifolds and that the water is from near the subsea floor.